





"POSTING THE BOOKS BETWEEN THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH."

---

## SPEECH

OF

# HON. JOHN J. PERRY, OF MAINE.

---

Delivered in the U. S. House of Representatives, March 7, 1860.

---

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the President's message—

Mr. PERRY said :

Mr. Chairman, since the adoption of the American Constitution, our beloved country has been called upon to pass through several fiery ordeals. Our Government was an experiment, and as such it has been put to severe tests and trials.

Upon one of these important occasions, when a crisis was apparently upon us, there stood up a hero, a chieftain, a patriot, clothed with authority by the American people, and solemnly declared by the great Eternal: "THE UNION, IT MUST AND SHALL BE PRESERVED."

The illustrious old hero, backed up and supported by millions of patriotic hearts, rallied around the Constitution of our common country, and the Union was saved. Since that time, we have been travelling on as a nation to glory, greatness, and power.

Although we have been increasing in wealth, extending our borders, developing our vast and varied national resources, diffusing the means of intelligence and education in every direction, there is an apparent restlessness, a stirring up of the bitter waters of sectional strife, in certain localities in this Government. The discordant notes of DISUNION ! DISUNION ! have in defiant tones grated upon our ears from the first day that we took our seats in this Hall, until the present time; while upon every Southern breeze there comes up to the Capitol, from Southern Executives, Southern Legislatures, Southern Conventions, and the Southern press, the same unwelcome threatenings.

At this point the question suggests itself, what has the North done, or left undone, that it should be thus rudely assailed? And what reason has the South for dealing out these bitter threats and denunciations against their brethren in the free States? This question, with its incidental connections, I now propose briefly to discuss; and while I feel called upon to speak plainly, and in all frankness, I mean to observe that strict courtesy and gentlemanly bearing which is due from every member upon this floor to his peers.

In the discussions which have here taken place, Southern gentlemen have expressed a willingness to stand by the *Constitution* of our common country, to observe in good faith its obligations and compromises. We, of the North, join hands with you here. We claim that we are not only loyal to this great fundamental law, but that we *have* been so in all times past. And here comes the issue to be tried: you charge us with numerous derelictions in duty; we charge them back upon you. You have arraigned the great Republican party of the Union before the high court of the American people, and charged it with treason to the Constitution; we fling all special pleadings to the winds, join issue upon the merits, and go to the country.

What is the Constitution? Is it a mere memorandum of an agreement, entered into by the States of this Union in their sovereign capacity as States, to be observed or broken at the pleasure of any one or more of the high contracting parties? Is it a great confederated partnership, in which the several States have agreed to do business under the firm name of the "Union," with the right reserved to each and every partner to withdraw at pleasure? Is it a compact or league between the several States, entered into and ratified by State sovereignty—simply an agreement that can be kept or broken at the will of any or either of the parties thereto? Is this a fair interpretation of the Constitution? I answer most emphatically in the negative. The reasons for this opinion are numerous and weighty. If this is all there is of the Constitution, then it need never have been formed. The thirteen original States or Colonies, as far back as before the Revolution, entered into a compact; they reduced this compact to writing, and it is found in the old Articles of Confederation, framed in 1777. Acting under this compact, the thirteen colonies sent forth to the world and posterity that great *magna charta* of Republican principles, the Declaration of Independence. Under this compact, our fathers struggled and toiled through seven long years of revolutionary warfare, and achieved the independence and liberties of our common country. The preamble to this compact defines the "Articles of Confedera-

tion to be a *perpetual union* between the States;" while the thirteenth and last article closes by declaring "that the articles thereof shall be inviolably observed by the States, and that the UNION SHALL BE PERPETUAL." Why did our fathers abandon the old league or compact formed under these Articles of Confederation, and substitute the Constitution? If they had been satisfied to have lived under a *league* or *compact*, they never would have changed their form of government; and this is the reason that they preferred a Constitution to a compact.

Although there has been a slight conflict of opinion among American statesmen and jurists upon this subject, yet a vast majority of the authorities concur in this opinion, that the Constitution is not a *league*, *compact*, or *confederacy*, but a *fundamental law*. The idea that the Constitution is a mere compact between the States is completely refuted by the instrument itself. In the preamble, it declares the "people," and not the States, made it, in words too plain and direct to be mistaken: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, do ordain and establish this Constitution." I make these remarks as the basis of what I may desire to say hereafter relative to the doctrine proclaimed by certain honorable gentlemen upon this floor—that a State, in its sovereign capacity, has a right peaceably to secede from the Union.

I now turn to another point involved in this controversy—namely, the compromises entered into upon the slavery question, between the North and the South, at the formation of the Constitution.

Neither the word "*slave*" nor "*slavery*" anywhere appears in the Constitution, and this omission was not accidental. Mr. Madison, who had more to do with framing the Constitution than any other man, said he "thought it wrong to admit into the Constitution the IDEA that there could be property in men." (3 Madison Papers, 142.) Mr. Sherman said "he was opposed to a tax on slaves, because it implied they were *property*," (3 Madison Papers, 1390.) Other members expressed similar opinions. Notwithstanding our fathers carefully guarded the language incorporated into the Constitution, with a direct view to the ultimate extinction of slavery, yet the fact is not to be denied, that the institution then existed in nearly all the States, "*under the laws thereof*;" and this fact entered into the compromises which resulted in its formation and adoption. The first compromise agreed upon is found in article one, section two, clause three, of the Constitution, and was a direct concession to the South. This provision allows a *property* basis of representation upon this floor, which is not allowed the North; the operation of which is to give to the slaveholding States to-day, as was truly remarked by an honorable gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. LAMAR,] twenty Representatives in this House based upon property.

The members of the Convention which framed the Constitution from the North contended that if "three-fifths" of the slave property in the South was to be added to the "whole number of free persons," then the exports—the products of

the slave population—should be taxed as an equivalent to the North. Mr. King expressed the opinions of the North when he said: "At all events, either slaves should not be represented or exports should be taxable." (3 Madison Papers, 1262.) The only equivalent which the North received was the connecting provision in the article and section above referred to, which declares, that in levying "direct taxes," they should be apportioned according to the basis of representation; and, as we raise our taxes from a tariff of duties levied upon imports, this provision is worthless to the people of the free States.

The next compromise embodied in the Constitution upon the slavery question is found in section nine, article one:

"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."

Prior to this time, Maryland, Virginia, and several other States, had abolished the foreign slave trade. A large majority of the Convention desired to abolish it at once. We have the most conclusive evidence upon this point. Mr. Iredell, in the North Carolina State Convention called to ratify the Constitution, said:

"It was the wish of a great majority of the Convention to put an end to the trade immediately, but South Carolina and Georgia would not agree to it."

Again he said:

"It is probable that all the members reprobated the inhuman traffic, but South Carolina and Georgia would not consent to an immediate prohibition of it; one reason was, that during the last war, the Revolution, they lost a vast number of negroes, which loss they wished to supply."—3 Elliot's Debates, 96, 97, 98.

Mr. Spaight, in the same Convention, said that

"The limitation of this trade to the term of twenty years was a compromise between the Eastern and Southern States—South Carolina and Georgia wished to extend the term—the Eastern States insisted on the entire abolition of the trade."—3 Elliot's Debates, 96.

General Pinckney, in the South Carolina ratification State Convention, said, that while some of the Eastern States were willing, for the sake of the South, to wait a little before putting stop to the slave traffic—

"The Middle States and Virginia made us no such proposition; they were for an immediate and total prohibition."—3 Elliot's Debates, 257.

Thus the fact is established and proved, that Congress was prevented from abolishing the slave trade for twenty years, as special favor to two Southern States of this Union.

The only remaining clause in the Constitution relating to slavery is article four, section two, clause three:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

This provision was another concession to slaveholding States.

And here it is important to inquire whether the framers of the Constitution considered slavery national or local? The rendition clause just quoted is an answer to the question: "Persons held to service or labor in one State, under

*the laws thereof.*" Here they put upon record, in the great fundamental law of the land, the fact that slaves are held "under the laws" of the States, and not by force of the Constitution. Its framers so expressed themselves in the Constitutional Convention. Mr. Gerry said:

"We had nothing to do with the conduct of States as to slaves, but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it."—*3 Madison Papers, page 1394.*

They left the whole question where they found it—with the States, to be continued or abolished as they severally, in their sovereign capacities, should determine.

II. The framers of the Constitution made that instrument with the desire and expectation that slavery would ultimately be abolished in all the States; that in this country it would come to a final end. This proposition is clearly demonstrated in their openly-avowed opinions upon the slavery question.

General Washington, although a slaveholder, believed slavery wrong. He freely expressed himself upon this point, and has left the clearest evidence behind him upon this question.

Thomas Jefferson, in his official acts and public writings, has left to posterity a record that cannot be mistaken. In his Notes on Virginia, he boldly declares:

"Nobody wishes more ardently than I, an abolition not only of the slave trade, but of the *condition of slavery.*"—*Page 170.*

Gouverneur Morris, in the Convention which formed the Constitution, said :

"He never could consent to uphold human slavery; it was a *nefarious institution.*"—*3 Madison Papers, 1263.*

Mr. Sherman said :

"That the abolition of slavery seemed to be going on in the United States, and that the good sense of the several States would, probably by degrees, complete it."—*3 Madison Papers, 1390.*

Colonel Mason, of Virginia, said :

"Slavery discourages the arts and manufactures, and brings the judgment of Heaven on a country."—*3 Madison Papers, 1391.*

In the Virginia Convention to ratify the Constitution, Mr. Henry said :

"Slavery is detested; we feel its fatal defects; we deplore it with all the pity of humanity."—*2 Eliot's Debates, 437.*

The illustrious William Pinkney, in the Maryland Legislature, in 1788, said :

"By the eternal principles of eternal justice, no master in the State has the right to hold his slave in bondage for a single hour. \* \* \* We may talk of liberty in our public councils, and fancy that we feel reverence for her dictates. \* \* \* In the name of Heaven, can we call ourselves the friends of equal freedom and the inherent rights of our species, when we wantonly pass laws inimical to each; when we reject every opportunity of destroying, by silent, imperceptible degrees, the horrid fabric of individual bondage, reared by the mercenary hands of those from whom the sacred flame of liberty received no devotion?"—*Williston's Eloquence of the United States, volume 5.*

But I will not further elaborate a proposition which cannot be successfully denied, by quoting additional extracts from the writings of early American statesmen.

2. The hypothesis here set up is proved by the cotemporaneous acts of our fathers. The provision in the Constitution relating to the suppression of the slave trade after 1808 is strong

evidence to this point. The enacting of the celebrated ordinance of 1787, by which *all* territory then outside of the States was made *forever free*, is another incontrovertible proof of their intentions.

3. The opinions of the founders of this Republic were not only acquiesced in and endorsed, but taken as authoritative expositions of the Constitution, by nearly all the great statesmen of the country during the first sixty years of its existence.

First, that Congress has power, under the Constitution, to prohibit slavery in the Territories. The ordinance of 1787, passed by the First Congress under the Constitution, in which were twenty members of the Federal Convention which framed the Constitution, is a direct exercise of this power. It passed unanimously, and was approved by General Washington. Subsequent acts, in which the same principle was directly recognised, were passed, as follows : an act, April 7, 1798, organizing Mississippi Territory; in the Sixth Congress, an act organizing Indiana Territory; an act, March 26, 1804, dividing Louisiana into two Territories; January 11, 1805, an act organizing Michigan Territory; February 3, 1809, an act establishing Illinois Territory; June 4, 1812, an act establishing Missouri Territory; March 3, 1817, an act relating to Alabama Territory; March 9, 1819, an act establishing Arkansas Territory; March 6, 1820, the Missouri compromise was established; March 10, 1822, an act establishing Florida Territory; April 20, 1836, an act establishing Wisconsin Territory; June 12, 1838, an act for the government of Iowa; and March 3, 1848, an act establishing the government of Oregon.

These different acts received the sanction of fourteen different Congresses, and the official approval of Presidents Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, and Polk. All these acts directly acknowledged the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories, and that it was right and expedient to exercise it.

Secondly, until within a very few years, the opinions of the early statesmen that slavery was dependent upon State regulations for its existence and protection—a local and not a national institution—has been uniformly concurred in by Congress, State Legislatures, the Judiciary of the United States and of the several States. The proof is found in the acts of Congress, of State Legislatures, and in the numerous decisions of the United States and State courts.

Mr. Chairman, having briefly referred to the Constitution, its compromises upon the slavery question, the rules of construction applicable to it, as handed down to us by its framers, and concurred in by all the great statesmen of the country for more than half a century, I now come to a material point involved in this discussion. Has the South received what legitimately belonged to her under the Constitution? and if there have been sectional aggressions, from which party have they come?

In discussing this matter, I shall deal in *facts and figures*, and not in inflammatory declamation

and vague generalities, which have been so much indulged in by gentlemen upon the other side.

1. Has the South had the property representation guaranteed by the Constitution? No one denies it; and she has to-day twenty Representatives upon this floor upon a property basis, while the free States have none. Taking the census of 1850 as the basis of calculation, six million free whites in the South have under this apportionment ninety members, thirteen million in the North have one hundred and forty-seven members. A ratio equal with the South would give the North one hundred and ninety-eight members.

2. The South has always had the benefit of a fugitive slave law to reclaim their runaway slaves. Some of the provisions of the present law are extremely obnoxious to the people of the free States; yet it has been enforced with as little difficulty as any other law of doubtful constitutionality, and made for the exclusive benefit of a particular section of country. It is true, slaves sometimes run away, and are not recaptured and carried back; and just as long as they possess the power of locomotion, just so long more or less of their number will abscond. This very fact is a sad commentary upon the assertion often made, respecting this uncertain kind of property, that the African prefers slavery to freedom.

It would be passing strange if the whole subject of negro slavery could be discussed upon slave territory, in the midst of the slave population, by Southern politicians, as it has been done for several years last past, without waking up, in the minds of some of this degraded race, ideas of personal liberty. If these negroes love slavery, and are contented, of course they will remain where they are; but if they get a little of Bunker Hill or Yorktown into their heads, judging from the past, they will be quite likely to suffer their magnetic attractions to vibrate in the direction of the north pole. Northern people are not to blame for all this. It is one of the incidents which always did and always will connect itself with your peculiar institution. Just so long as there is slavery, just so long there will be runaways from it. All past history proves this fact. Then, again, the way and manner in which you sometimes undertake to execute it are highly exceptionable. Under some fraudulent, false pretence, the fugitive is often assaulted, knocked down, and dragged off like a dog, hurried away before some five-dollar commissioner, and by him summarily sent off into slavery, upon proof that would not warrant a magistrate in giving judgment for a claim of four or six pence before a country justice.

The very first person you undertook to reclaim under this law was a *free* man, and when your Union-saving slave-catchers from New York landed him at the door of his alleged master, in Maryland, like an honest, high-minded, honorable man—as I am frank to say many of the slaveholders are—he denied ever owning him, and the kidnappers had to let him run. A *fair trial* in a case which places a person's personal liberty for life in the power of a single man, and

that man sometimes the corrupt tool of the power that made him, is bad enough, in all conscience; but when those engaged in this business undertake to make a mockery of this, do you wonder the people of the free States sometimes get a little excited?

If our Southern friends expect the people of the free States to turn slave hunters, and join in the chase in running down the panting fugitive, they will be disappointed. We never agreed to any such thing, and we never will do it; it is not "in the bond."

Bad as the law is, and as objectionable as is the manner in which it is attempted to be executed, it is enforced by the people of the free States. The honorable gentleman from Ohio [ex-Governor Conwin] has told you in this House it is enforced in the West. So it is in the middle States, and so it has been in New England. Yes, sir, Boston court-house has been put in chains, and the peaceable people of that State kept out of the temple of justice by Federal bayonets, and the Treasury of the United States robbed of its thousands and tens of thousands to pay the bills for returning fugitive slave.

It is due to fairness to add, that individually, I believe the present fugitive slave law unconstitutional; and if a bill were introduced into this House for its unconditional repeal, I would vote for it, and in so doing should reflect the opinions of a vast majority of my constituents of all parties.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to stop here, but shall pursue this subject further, and show that the people of the free States have not only kept good faith with the South so far as their constitutional obligations are concerned, but have dealt not only fairly but generously in other matters growing out of the relations existing between the two sections. This leads me to my third point under this division of my subject:

	Sq. Miles.
At the treaty of peace in 1783, the United States had a territory of.....	820,690
Since that time we have acquired by—	
The Louisiana purchase.....	890,579
The Florida purchase.....	66,990
The Texas annexation.....	318,000
The Oregon treaty.....	308,052
The treaty with Mexico.....	522,955
Total territory acquired since 1783.....	<u>2,115,486</u>

From the territory thus purchased, there have been five new slave States admitted into the Union, to wit: Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas; and four free States, as follows: California, Iowa, Minnesota, and Oregon. The five slave States have ten Senators and sixteen Representatives in Congress; the four free States, eight Senators and seven Representatives. And in this division of territory between the two sections, it ought not to be forgotten that the joint resolution annexing Texas has a provision that four more slave States may be carved out of that territory. To say nothing of this, the South has, out of territory thus acquired, one more State, two more United States Senators, and nine more Representatives, than the free States;

and yet they keep up the cry of aggression! aggression! against the North.

Another inquiry here suggests itself. What has been the cost of the territory purchased by the United States, and who paid for it, the people of the free or slave States? I have spent a good deal of time and labor in collecting, from the documents in the Government archives and other sources, the aggregate cost of our acquired territory. Many of the items can be accurately stated; others have to be estimated. The expense of the Mexican war is given by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report in 1851. (*Appendix to Globe, vol. 23, p. 21.*) Below, we give, in a table, the result of our investigations, and, where we have been obliged to form estimates, have been careful not to overstate them:

Louisiana Territory purchased in 1803.....	\$15,000,000
Interest paid on same .....	8,327,353
Florida bought of Spain.....	5,000,000
Interest paid on same.....	1,430,000
Texas, for boundary claim.....	10,000,000
Texas, for indemnity claim.....	10,000,000
Texas, for creditors in Thirty-third Congress.....	7,750,000
Indian expenses, all kinds inclusive (estimate).....	5,000,000
To purchase navy, pay troops (estimate).....	5,000,000
All other expenditures not included above (estimate).....	3,000,000
Expense of Mexican war.....	217,755,575
Soldiers' pensions and bounty lands (estimated).....	7,000,000
Expenses of Florida war.....	100,000,000
Soldiers' pensions and bounty lands (estimate).....	15,000,000
To remove Indians, &c. (estimated).....	5,000,000
Amount paid for New Mexico, by treaty.....	15,000,000
Paid to extinguish Indian titles (estimated).....	100,000,000
Paid to Georgia.....	3,082,000
Paid for Arizona, purchased of Mexico.....	10,000,000
	842,764,928

Who paid the bills? Let us see. I find by the researches I have made from official documents, and other reliable sources of information, that from 1791 to 1850 the total revenue collected from customs is as follows—I bring it up to this time, as most of my calculations are made up to 1850:

Whole amount of revenue collected.....	\$1,169,299,265
Amount of revenue in free States.....	932,222,911
Expenses of collecting in free States.....	36,894,926
Net sum paid into Treasury from free States.....	895,327,985
Amount of revenue in slave States.....	237,076,354
Expenses of collecting in slave States.....	17,382,393
Net sum paid into Treasury from slave States.....	219,713,965
Excess paid by free States.....	675,814,024

Thus, facts and figures prove that, while the slave States have taken the "lion's share" from the territory purchased, the free States have paid THREE-FOURTHS of the purchase-money.

Fourth. Let us look at some of the offices under the General Government, and see whether the South has had its share. I have prepared from the official records the following table, which speaks for itself. From this, it appears the South, with six millions, have over three-fifths of the important offices, and the North, with thirteen millions, less than two-fifths. I have looked into the localities from which our foreign ministers, consuls, and other important officers, have been taken, and find that the South have had more than double the number to which they have been entitled by their relative population.

Officers.	Years filled from slave States.	Years filled from free States.	Difference in favor of the South.
President of U. States..	48	26	22
President of the Senate,			
<i>pro tem.</i> .....	62	11	51
Speaker of the House..	45	25	20
Secretary of State.....	40	29	11
Secretary of War.....	38	34	4
Secretary of Navy.....	30	30	
Attorney General.....	42	27	15
Chief Justice Supreme Court U. States.....	57	9	48
Associate Justices of Supreme Court U. States	225	194	61
	617	385	232

The South have not been contented with monopolizing nearly all the great offices in the country, but they make a lordly claim to all the subordinate places. In all the Departments in this city, Northern men have been crowded out to make way for Southerners. I find, in a speech which I made in the Thirty-fourth Congress, the following table, which I carefully prepared from the Blue Book. From this, it appears that the North, taking their population as a basis, are fairly entitled to more than *two-thirds*, yet they get only about *one-fourth*. Oh, the aggressive North!

Departments.	Whole No. employed.	From slave territory.	From free territory.	Difference in favor of South.
State.....	30	17	13	4
Treasury.....	445	255	190	125
Interior.....	540	349	191	158
War.....	84	64	20	44
Navy.....	52	39	13	28
Post Office....	90	47	43	4
Attorney Gen. ....	6	5	1	4
	1,242	806	441	365

Just look at the committees of both branches in the last Congress, and then cry out "Northern aggression." Of the twenty-two important committees in the Senate, the slave States had the chairman upon sixteen, and the free States six. And of the twenty-five important committees of the House, the South had the chairman upon seventeen, and the North eight. Thirteen million free whites in the North are represented at the head of fourteen standing committees in Congress, while six million in the South are represented at the head of thirty-three standing committees. This packing operation on committees to favor the South was no new thing in the Thirty-fifth Congress; they have *always* had it in just that kind of a way. Such Northern aggression! It should be borne in mind that *these committees shape the whole legislation of the country*.

Again: look at the Senate committees of this Congress; out of twenty-two committees, the South have the chairman upon sixteen and the North on six; and upon every single one of the fourteen important committees, the slave States have *all* the chairmen. Of the eighteen free States represented in the Senate, fourteen are totally disfranchised upon the heads of the Senate committees; while twenty-four Republican Senators, representing more than twelve million of the people of the Union, out of one hundred and twenty-five places on said committees, get only thirty-nine, and that at the tail-end of every one upon which they are placed. I call upon

the country, North and South, to look at this beautiful picture of *nationality, equality, Democracy, and magnanimous, generous South.*

Fourth. In 1800 the seat of the General Government was, by virtue of a previous act of Congress, removed to the slave territory where it now stands. Washington was then nearly an unbroken wilderness; now it numbers nearly seventy thousand inhabitants. Northern votes brought the seat of Government here; and it has been built up, to a very great extent, by Northern treasure. These splendid massive piles of marble, which rear their lofty columns in every direction in this city, were built by *Government money*. Who graded the beautiful lawns that stretch themselves out around these buildings like some panoramic fancy sketch? Who planted the shade trees that ornament them? *Government money* did all this. Yes, sir, the Federal Treasury has been depleted for the last sixty years of its millions and tens of millions to build up this great city upon slave territory. Who gets the benefits? Principally the slave States. Washington city furnishes a great market for Southern produce, raised in Virginia and Maryland. The Government not only has *built* this city, but annually appropriates enormous sums from the Federal Treasury to support it. It grades and lights its streets, paves its walks. It has gone seventeen miles up the Potomac, and plundered the national Treasury of about five million dollars, to furnish the city with splendid water-works. It indirectly feeds and clothes a large number of its inhabitants. It furnishes their swaddling-clothes when first they open their eyes upon the light of creation, and pays the sexton's bill when life's fitful scenes are over.

But I will do no injustice to the good people of the city of Washington, but will give them an item of credit which they may file in set-off against my general allegations. It is this: they gratuitously furnish an army of patriotic men who are exceedingly anxious to serve their country, in places of trust and profit, who will, just as circumstances require, sing paens to DOUGLAS or SEWARD, BOOCOCK or SHERMAN, always pitching their key-note to the tune of the "loaves and fishes." And, as evidence of their patriotism and loyalty to the Constitution, we have heard many of their numbers, day after day, during the sitting of this Congress, vociferously *applauding* disunion sentiments uttered upon this floor, which, if carried into practical operation, would raze this magnificent Capitol to the ground, a heap of smouldering ruins, light up their houses with the torch-light of the incendiary, desolate their fields, murder their wives and children in a war of strife, and make this great city only a fit habitation for the owls and bats.

Having shown that the North has been generous to the South, and fulfilled all its constitutional obligations to her in letter and in spirit, I now desire, in all fairness, to examine the other side of this question; and, in discharging this part of my duty, I shall "carry the war into Africa."

1. Article one of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States provides that—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

I charge that the South has not always in good faith lived up to the above provision, inasmuch as that section of the Union, for a great number of years, by Congressional action, aided by Northern Democrats, refused to receive petitions coming from the people of the free States. Gag resolutions, by which the petitions of the people were treated with contempt, were from year to year forced through Congress. For years the people sent up to the Capitol their memorials, and they were summarily met, and their petitions kicked out of doors in both houses of Congress. For a long time this war of the slaveholding interest against the people was waged with fierceness, but at length, through the determined will and perseverance of the "old man eloquent," aided by his patriotic compeers, the rights of American citizens were once more restored, and the Constitution vindicated against those who had rudely assailed it.

2. The South has undertaken, in carrying out their aggressive policy upon the North, to *reverse* the Territorial policy of the Government, as established by its founders, and concurred in by every National Administration for more than half a century.

I shall not now stop to argue the constitutional right of Congress to inhibit slavery in the Territories, for that has been successfully done a thousand times before, upon the floors of Congress and in other places; I have already said mainly what I desire to upon that point.

As we have shown—from the passage of the ordinance of 1787 to the establishment of Oregon Territory in 1848—the policy of every department of the Government was *uniform*; that Congress had the right under the Constitution to prohibit slavery in the Territories of the United States. Hence it follows, that the introduction of the *Wilmot proviso* was, in no proper sense, an infringement upon Southern rights; for it had been made a great fundamental principle of the Government itself. The very converse of this proposition was true, that the resistance of the South to the application of this wholesome rule to the territory acquired by the treaty with Mexico, was, *per se*, an aggression upon Northern rights.

At this juncture of affairs in this country, what right had the South to step up to the North and demand a *new* policy? What right had the Southern States to carry their local laws into the Territories, to the exclusion of the people of the free States?

But our Southern friends claim what they call an *equal right* in the territory of the United States. But the demand they make does not stop with an "*equal*" balancing of the scales. They demand *more*. They not only ask to carry with them into the Territories everything which the common law recognises as property—*everything* as property which the people of the free

States can carry with them; but they demand to carry and plant upon free territory a system of involuntary servitude, which invades the rights of the free laborer from the North, robs him of his capital, disgraces him in society, and in the end drives him away, as I shall hereafter show.

If it is said the Constitution, *proprio vigore*, establishes slavery in the Territories, I answer, that is begging the question. We deny it; and that is the very question now in issue which the PEOPLE, and not the Supreme Court of the United States, have got to settle.

3. The terms upon which Texas was annexed to the United States were unjust to the North and free States. This was a Southern measure, to strengthen the slave interest in this country. Its whole history shows it. The joint resolutions providing for annexation provided for the formation of four new States out of this territory; and, in fairness to the free States, at least an equal portion should have been free territory; but, instead of this, they provide that all territory south of 30° 30' should be left open to slavery, and all north of that line free. Now, any one who will take pains to look upon a map of Texas, will find only a mere fragment lying north of the Missouri compromise line. It is too small ever to make a single State, and is a virtual surrender of the whole territory to slavery, under the miserable pretence of a division. Mr. Buchanan, then a member of the Senate, voted for the extension of the Missouri compromise line through Texas, and made a speech in favor of it, thereby acknowledging, as Mr. Benton says, in his Thirty Years' View, the validity and constitutionality of the Missouri compromise.

4. The next aggression upon the North which I shall notice, was the repeal of the Missouri compromise. The history of that compromise has been so thoroughly discussed before the country that a repetition of it is unnecessary. It is sufficient to say that it was a Southern measure. Upon the vote on the question of admitting Missouri with the restriction, twenty Senators from the South voted for it—only two against it. In the House of Representatives, upon the vote inserting the Missouri restriction, thirty-nine Southern Representatives voted for it, and thirty-seven against. We have not only the recorded votes to show this a Southern measure, but other testimony direct to the point. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, who was a member of that Congress, and voted against the bill, in a letter, dated "Congress Hall, March 2, 1820, three o'clock at night," speaking of the Missouri compromise, said:

*"It is considered here by the slaveholding States as a great triumph."*

Mr. Benton, in his Thirty Years in the United States Senate, says:

*"This [the Missouri compromise] was the work of the South, sustained by the UNITED VOICE of Mr. MONROE'S CABINET, the united voice of the Southern Senators, and a majority of the Southern Representatives."*

Mr. Monroe's Cabinet then consisted of John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State; John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War; William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury; Smith Thomp-

son, Secretary of the Navy; John McLean, Postmaster General; and William Wirt, Attorney General.

No special pleading, no circumlocution of argument, no declamation, can destroy or blot out these facts. There they stand, and there they will forever stand, as conclusive proof that the Missouri compromise was a Southern measure; the "work of the South," and a "great Southern triumph." The consideration received by the South for the restriction was paid down by the admission of Missouri as a slave State.

This leads to another inquiry. Has the South stood by their own compromise, or violated it? This question, too, shall be answered by stubborn facts—facts which politicians neither North nor South can ever disprove. In the Senate, upon the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, nineteen Southern Senators voted for it; two against it. In the House, sixty-nine Southern members voted for it; and nine against it. And yet we are coolly told, because a Northern man introduced the bill, it is a Northern measure. Will gentlemen from the South stand up here and tell me that a bill which commanded the votes of eighty-eight Southern men, with only eleven against it, was not a Southern measure? If it be said Kansas and Nebraska will be eventually free States, my answer is, no thanks to the South for that. I charge, then, that the Missouri compromise was a Southern measure; and that the Southern men went almost entirely in a body for a violation of their own compact—a compact to which they had made themselves a party.

5. My next charge against the South is, that, after it had broken down the Missouri restriction, under the pretence that the people of a Territory were, by the Kansas-Nebraska bill, to be "left perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way," it undertook to force slavery into Kansas, first by violence, and secondly by fraud.

The first election held in Kansas was on the 29th day of November, 1854. The polls were taken forcible possession of by a horde of armed ruffians from the slave States; and, out of 2,258 votes cast for General Whitfield, the Democratic candidate for Congress, 1,729 were thrown by those lawless invaders. These facts appear in the report of a committee of the Thirty-fourth Congress, sent out by the House to investigate these frauds. (See House Document No. 200, first session Thirty-fourth Congress.)

In January and February, 1855, a census of the inhabitants of the Territory was taken, by order of the Governor; and 2,905 men were found, by this census, qualified to vote for members of a Territorial Legislature. On the 30th of March, of the same year, an election for members of a Territorial Legislature was held. At this election, another armed horde was made into the Territory, and 6,309 votes were returned as cast. A subsequent investigation proved only 1,410 legal votes thrown, leaving 4,900 illegal votes cast by ruffian invaders.

The Territorial Legislature chosen at this worse than mock election passed the infamous "Kansas code"—a compilation of laws worse

than the code of Draco. This illegitimate Legislature passed an act, providing that in October, 1856, the people should vote whether a Constitutional Convention should be called or not. The bona fide citizens of the Territory spurned the act of these "usurpers," and refused to participate in the election. A few tools of the Administration voted; and the bogus Legislature, on the 19th of February, 1857, passed an act providing for the election of delegates to frame a State Constitution. The law providing for the Convention and election of delegates required a census to be taken, and the votes registered, in the thirty-four counties recognised as election districts. In nineteen of these thirty-four counties, there was no census taken; and in fifteen of the thirty-four, there was no registry of voters. Governor Walker, in his letter of resignation, says these fifteen disfranchised counties contained more voters than were cast in the whole Territory at this election. This election was a mockery, and the main body of the Free-State men very properly refused to have anything to do with it.

Subsequently, the people of Kansas, at their Territorial election in October, 1857, achieved an overwhelming Free-State victory. After this, the Convention of "usurpers" assembled, and framed the atrocious "Lecompton Constitution." These "usurpers" did not dare to submit this Constitution to a fair vote of the people, for they knew they would spurn it; so they provided that "no alteration should be made to affect the right of property in the ownership of slaves until after 1864;" and then provided, in the schedule, that it should be submitted to the people, and the ballots should contain, "for the Constitution with slavery, or for the Constitution without slavery."

At the election on the 21st of December, 1857, the pro-slavery clause was voted into this Constitution by illegal votes and false returns. These frauds were investigated by the Governor of the Territory, and it was shown that, at Oxford, where there were but forty-two votes, all told, over one thousand votes were returned. At Shawnee, where there were but forty legal votes, twelve hundred votes were returned; and from Delaware Crossing, which had only forty-three legal votes, four hundred votes were returned. I have not stopped to even glance at cities sacked, peaceable citizens murdered in cool blood, public highways lined with assassins and robbers—burglaries, arsons, and other crimes, committed by border-ruffian raids into Kansas—but have briefly given an authentic history of pro-slavery violence and fraud at the ballot-box, up to the time the Lecompton swindle was sent to Congress by James Buchanan.

Well knowing these facts, the President of the United States not only sent this Constitution to Congress, with a message urging its adoption, but exerted the whole power and patronage of his Administration to force it through Congress. Is proof demanded? Let me call attention to some remarks made in this House by an honorable member from New Jersey, who was also a

member of the last Congress. I mean Mr. ADRAIN. He said:

"During the Lecompton controversy, I was approached in such a manner as shows corruption on the part of the Administration. If I had given my support to the Lecompton policy, I was assured that I could secure a foreign appointment for one most near and dear to me."—*Daily Globe of December 13.*

This is but a solitary case, among many others. No greater outrage was ever attempted to be perpetrated upon the people of the free States; and yet it was most emphatically a Southern measure. Here is the proof: in the Senate, every Southern member, with two exceptions, voted for the bill; and in the House, the entire South, with seven exceptions, supported the measure.

The measure finally assumed the shape of the English bill, went to the people of Kansas, and was by them rejected with scorn and contempt by more than ten thousand majority.

This is a "specimen article" of Democratic popular sovereignty. I leave the country to make further comments.

6. The South have undertaken to drive free labor from the Territories by force of judicial construction.

I here refer to the Dred Scott decision, in which a majority of the court have travelled out of the record to overturn the well-settled opinions of a great majority of American jurists and statesmen, agreed to and acquiesced in in all parts of the country for more than sixty years. When a majority of the judges decided Dred Scott was not a citizen of the United States, and was not rightfully in court, it was an end of the case. But when they undertook to travel out of the record, and give opinions involving questions not legally before them, their opinions have no binding force upon the people of the country. The able and conclusive opinions of Justices McLean and Curtis, upon the question of Congressional intervention in the Territories, are entitled to equal respect with those of a majority of the court. Great political questions, involving matters of national policy, are for the people, and not the Supreme Court.

James Buchanan entertained and expressed the same opinions now entertained by the Republican party upon this question, in 1841. On the 7th of July, of that year, he made a speech in the United States Senate on the bank question. Speaking of the fact that the United States court had decided a national bank constitutional, he said:

"Now, if it were not unparliamentary language, and if I did not desire to treat all my friends on this [Whig] side of the House with the respect which I feel for them, I would say that the idea of the question having been settled so as to bind the consciences of members of Congress when voting on the present bill, is ridiculous and absurd. If all the judges and all the lawyers in Christendom had decided in the affirmative, when the question is thus brought home to me as a legislator, bound to vote for or against a new charter, open oath to support the Constitution, I must exercise my own judgment. I would treat with profound respect the arguments and opinions of judges and constitutional lawyers; but if, after all, they fail to convince me that the law was constitutional, I should be guilty of perjury before high Heaven if I voted in its favor."

"But even if the Judiciary had settled the question, I should never hold myself bound by their decision while acting in a legislative character. Unlike the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Bates], I shall never consent to place the liberties of the people in the hands of any judicial tribunal."

Now, this same James Buchanan stultifies himself; allows the South to *back him down* from the tenable position he occupied in 1841; takes the back track, and declares this same Supreme Court has "made a final settlement of the slavery question in the Territories," that "neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, NOR ANY HUMAN POWER, can annul or impair;" and yet, because the people refuse to follow him into the very *sewers* of absolute construction, judicial despotism, and tyranny, the President insults their honesty and intelligence, by denouncing them as traitors and fanatics.

The *obiter dictum* of the court in the Dred Scott case, relative to Congressional sovereignty over the Territories, has been caught up by the South, and an attempt made by Democratic politicians to give it the authority of law. This is an assumption against right; a demand set up against the people of the North without authority. The people of the North were neither parties nor privies in the Dred Scott case; and hence they are not estopped from contesting the usurpations set up against them by the court. The sequence growing out of these premises cannot be misunderstood. This attempt to plant slavery upon free soil, and spread it over every foot of territory outside of State lines, merely because five men have undertaken to say so, in a matter not legally before them, is a most unwarrantable aggression against the people of the free States. It is such an unjustifiable encroachment upon the rights of the free laboring millions of this country as they *never will submit to*. It is a narrow-minded sectional policy, which can never be made national in the Union or out of it. It is a demand made by less than half a million slaveholders to *monopolize* more than *one million square miles* of territory, to the exclusion of twenty-six million freemen, who have no interest in slave property. It is a monstrous aggression, and one that should be met and repelled at every hazard, and without regard to consequences.

7. The South, although numerically less by one-half than the North, claim the *exclusive control* of the General Government. Men of the South, especially her politicians, seem to have got an idea into their heads that they are born to rule, and the people of the free States are born to obey. It is the boast of the slaveholders that *they have ruled and governed this country from its infancy*. Listen to what a distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] said in a speech in the United States Senate, March 4, 1858:

"The Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] says that you intend to take the Government from us, that it will pass from our hands. Perhaps what he says is true—it may be; but do not forget, it can never be forgotten, it is written on the brightest page of human history, that we, THE SLAVEHOLDERS OF THE SOUTH, took our country in her infancy, and, after RULING her for sixty out of seventy years of her existence, we shall surrender her to you without a stain upon her honor, boundless in prosperity, incalculable in her strength, the wonder and admiration of the world."—Appendix to the *Congressional Globe*, vol. 37, p. 71.

The honorable Senator says, "the slaveholders of the South have ruled the country sixty out of seventy years," and he understands the matter

precisely as I do, that they are ruling it now. According to the last census, the free white population of the United States was, in gross numbers, eighteen million, and while this favored class—the slaveholders—numbered less than three hundred and fifty thousand, they rule seventeen and a half million not possessed of slave property. African slavery has been converted into an engine of political power, through the agency of the Democratic party. Under what article or section in the Constitution has an aristocracy of wealth, combined in three hundred and fifty thousand persons, "ruled" the teeming millions of this country for "sixty out of seventy years?"

If it is asked how the South, being in the minority, has succeeded in controlling the country? I answer, it has been done by creating and fostering a spirit of *sectionalism*, through the agency of party machinery. Colonel Benton, who is certainly good authority in this matter, in his *Thirty Years in the Senate*, says that Mr. Calhoun, in 1830—

"Went home from Congress, and told his friends that the South could never be united against the North on the tariff question; that the sugar interests of Louisiana would keep her out; that the basis of Southern union must be shifted to the SLAVE QUESTION."—Vol. 2, p. 786.

This policy of "uniting the slave States" upon the slavery question was inaugurated by Mr. Calhoun. It was persisted in by him and his followers until it entirely broke up old party lines. It destroyed the old Whig party, and completely corrupted and sectionalized the Democratic party, and placed it under the control of the slave power, where it has remained until this day. The "Texas Plot," Colonel Benton declares, in the work already alluded to, was originated to kill Mr. Van Buren, and it did its work. He had a majority of votes at the National Convention, in 1844, at which Mr. Polk was nominated; but the South managed to get the "two-thirds rule," which enabled them to defeat him. The South, in the same Convention, defeated the late Governor Fairfield, of my own State, for the Vice Presidency, and nominated Mr. Dallas, although the latter had but thirteen votes on the first ballot.

8. Another aggressive movement is now being agitated in the South, which is clearly against the Constitution and the laws. I well know distinguished gentlemen upon this floor have arisen in their places and denied any intent to make this matter a party test, or to repeal the laws which make the foreign slave trade piracy. I give them all the benefits of this disclaimer; yet it is not denied that this is a mooted question in the South. The President, in his recent message, admits that the *Wanderer* brought over one cargo, numbering three or four hundred. Again he says: "Those engaged in this unlawful enterprise have been rigorously prosecuted, but not with as much success as their crimes deserved;" an admission which shows a deep sympathy of feeling with the enterprise among the Southern people. If the laws cannot be enforced, there is no occasion for agitating for their repeal; and I understand there has not been a single conviction in any of our Southern courts

of any person who has been engaged in this nefarious business.

While the people of the free States, in their courts, enforce the fugitive slave law, odious as it is to a large majority of them, the South fails to convict or punish persons engaged in a trade declared by the General Government to be piracy. I leave the country to judge between us.

9. Another clear aggression upon the rights of the free States is a demand for a Congressional code to fasten slavery upon the people of the Territories against their will. Mr. Buchanan, in his message, the mouthpiece of his party, now owned and controlled by Southern men, said :

"I cordially congratulate you upon the final settlement, by the Supreme Court of the United States, of the question of slavery in the Territories, which had presented an aspect so truly formidable at the commencement of my administration. The right has been established of every citizen to take his property of any kind, including slaves, into the common Territories belonging equally to all the states of the Confederacy, and to have it protected there under the Federal Constitution. Neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature nor any human power has any authority to annul or impair that vested right."

And here I wish to call the attention of the country to the facts here assumed—that the court has settled this question—that the Constitution protects slavery in the Territories, and that "neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair this vested right." This is Democracy in 1860. One would think, by analogy of reasoning, that if there is no "human power" on earth that can even "impair" the right of a slaveholder to his slave property in the Territories, that ought to be satisfactory to him; yet that class demand Federal legislation to compel the free white laborers in the Territories into a servile submission—to kiss the hand that strikes down their capital, and degrades them to the condition of menial slaves.

A great leader in the Democratic party—I mean Senator Iverson, of Georgia—in a speech in the Senate a few weeks since, said :

"He believed, and the Southern people believed, that under the Constitution they had a right to emigrate to any of the Territories with their slave property, and, when there, have a right to the protection of the law in the enjoyment of that property, and Congress has the power to give that protection, and it is its duty to do it."

We have here an authentic exposition of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. We now understand what the Democratic party mean when they say that "the people of a Territory should be left **PERFECTLY FREE** to form their own domestic institutions." First, that the Constitution, of its own force, establishes slavery in the Territories; and, second, that Congress should enact a code placing ropes around the necks of the citizens of a Territory opposed to it; thereby degrading free white labor to the same level with African slave labor. Not only does the South, through its authorized agent, the so-called Democratic party, claim the right to carry slaves into all the Territories of the United States, and there hold them by judicial construction; but it demands Congressional intervention, by which the iron heel of despotism shall be fastened upon the necks of all persons therein opposed to the in-

sitution—a despotism which prevents any attempt, on their part, through their Territorial Legislature or otherwise, to rid themselves of what they believe a positive evil. If the Constitution makes slaves of the blacks in the Territories of the United States, it only needs such a code as is now demanded by the South to make slaves of the whites.

10. Another charge I have against the South is, the violation of article four, section two, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Also, of article five of the amendments to the Constitution, which expressly provides, that

"No person \* \* shall be deprived of life, LIBERTY, or property, without due process of law."

Under the Constitution, a citizen of Maine on lawful business has a right to travel through any Southern State without molestation, provided he interferes with none of the lawful rights of the people of that State. Southern gentlemen travel through the free States, and everywhere are treated with becoming respect and consideration. They are suffered everywhere to mingle with the people of the North, enjoying *every* right possessed by the people they are visiting. Not so with Northern men, when travelling in the Southern States. There a system of espionage is in operation, exceedingly annoying to a traveller. Strangers from the North, instead of meeting with that generous hospitality which they are always ready, when at home, to extend their Southern brethren, are watched, scrutinized, questioned; their baggage is overhauled, their persons searched, and upon mere suspicion are thrust into jail. A mere expression of opinion, inadvertently uttered, in some localities, is an unpardonable crime, for which they are visited with the grossest insults. Men, for merely uttering sentiments which have been taught by Jefferson and other Southern men, have been dragged into prison, lynched, tarred and feathered, and their lives threatened by infuriated mobs.

I will refer to a few recent cases. The *Charleston Mercury*, of the 17th of December, says—

"That a man, supposed to be an Abolitionist, of dark complexion, with black hair, and a scar over the left eye, about five feet eleven inches in height, and calling himself James W. Rivers, was taken up on the 13th by the vigilante committee, tarred and feathered, and the right side of his head shaven."

A few weeks ago, an Irishman who had been naturalized, and had always voted the Democratic ticket, as he says, a citizen of Pennsylvania, while at work on the State Capitol at Columbia, South Carolina, not in the hearing of slaves or any black man, but to his associate laborers, uttered sentiments not considered exactly orthodox; for which he was caught, put in jail, stripped, and thirty-nine lashes put upon his bare back; a bucket of tar poured upon him, and feathers applied. He was then allowed a pair of pants, and, after being imprisoned a further length of time, was put on board the cars for New York, where he arrived, and related the facts above given.

A clergyman, one of the most respectable citizens of Connecticut, a bookseller, was arrested

in one of the Southern States a short time since; and, on suspicion, without a shadow of evidence against him, thrust into jail, and on the interference of some of the citizens of his State was finally liberated; but not until he had received sufficient abuse to make him a maniac. During a speech in this House by an honorable member from Georgia, [Mr. CRAWFORD,] on the 15th of December last, the following colloquy took place:

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Beecher said that he would preach the same doctrines in Virginia as in Massachusetts. Brown says: 'Beecher, why don't you come and do it?' I ask you why you do not come on?"

"Mr. KILGORE. I will answer the gentleman, if he will permit me. I will tell the gentleman why Mr. Beecher would not preach in Virginia. Because liberty of speech is denied in the South; and if he were to go there, he would get a coat of tar and feathers.

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; not only would he be denied liberty of speech, but he would be denied personal liberty also, and would be hung higher than Haman."

Not only is Beecher threatened with the gallows if he goes South, but the distinguished Senator from New York is threatened with the halter if he is ever found in that quarter. An honorable member from Mississippi, [Mr. DAVIS,] in a speech on the 8th of December last, is reported in the *Globe* to have said:

"Virginia has decided, and has hung the traitor, Brown, and will hang the traitor, SEWARD, if he is found in her border. [Laughter.]"

Now, I put it to our Southern friends, when you and we are both living under the same Constitution which declares, "That the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States," whether these things are not unjust toward the people of the free States? Not only are the citizens of the North threatened with stripes, imprisonment, and death, if we visit the Southern States, and that under the summary process of mob law, but, from recent indications, peaceable, unoffending citizens in the South are to be driven out by unlawful violence, not for overt acts—not for anything they have done; but merely for *entertaining opinions* held by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison—nearly all the early fathers of the Republic. The Cincinnati *Commercial*, of December 21, contains the following narrative, which explains itself:

"Thirty-six persons arrived in this city from Kentucky, yesterday, having been warned to leave the State, for the crime of holding slavery to be a sin. They are from Berea and vicinity, Madison county, Kentucky, where they were living industrious, sober, and peaceful lives. Most of these persons are stopping at the Denison House, though a portion have been received at private houses.

"They are inoffensive persons, men of peace, and would not have been driven from any community in the world except one oppressed and benighted by the slave system. They were neighbors, friends, and coworkers of the Rev. John G. Fee, whose reputation as an earnest and quiet opponent of slavery is well known to the country. Among the exiles are the Rev. J. R. Rogers, principal of a flourishing school at Berea, and his family; J. G. Reed and family; John S. Hanson and family. Mr. Hanson is a native of Kentucky, and a hard-working, thrifty man. He had recently erected a steam saw-mill, and owns five hundred acres of land in Madison county, Kentucky. The Rev. J. F. Boughton; E. T. Hayes, and S. Life, carpenters; A. G. W. Parker, a native of South Carolina; —Toney, a native of Tennessee; John Smith, a native of Ohio, a farmer, who has lived in Kentucky some years. \* \* \*

"Mr. Rogers describes the warning that he received quite graphically. He was in his cottage, when a summons for him to appear was heard. On going to the door, he discov-

ered an imposing cavalcade, sixty-five well-mounted men being drawn up in warlike array. He was informed that he had ten days in which to leave the State. This was on the 23d of December. He told them that he had not consciously violated any law of the Commonwealth, and that, if he had unconsciously done so, he would be most happy to be tried according to law. He was informed that they did not know that he had violated any law, but that his principles were incompatible with the public peace, and that he must go."

I make no comment, but leave the fair-minded men, North and South, to pass judgment upon such proceedings. But I do protest, in the name of the eighteen million freemen in the free States, against a system of vindictive espionage, which arrests peaceable, unoffending citizens upon groundless suspicions, tries them at the revolutionary tribunal of Judge Lynch, and then murders them, under the miserable pretext of carrying into execution the mandates of mob law.

Who has not heard of Bayard Taylor, the celebrated traveller, who has been the world over, among savage and civilized men in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America? In a recent letter published by him, in answer to a letter from the Young Men's Christian Association of Richmond, Virginia, breaking off a lecture engagement because Mr. Taylor had at some time been a literary correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, he said :

"I have travelled in all the principal portions of the earth; I know all forms of government and all religious creeds, from personal observation and study; but nowhere, in any of the lands or races most bitterly hostile to republicanism and Christianity, have I ever been subjected to a narrower or more insulting censorship."

In fifteen States in this Union, an "American citizen," peaceably and lawfully travelling, has no more protection than he would have in a land of savages, upon whom the light of civilization had never dawned. It is God's truth, that there is not a despotic Government in the Old World, where an American citizen, living in the North, would not be *better* protected than in the slave States of this Union. The "stars and stripes" afford protection to the humblest citizen abroad, yet, upon our own soil, in fifteen State sovereignties, owing allegiance to the Federal Union and to the Constitution, it gives no more protection to a freeman of the North than the black flag of a West-Indian pirate.

This is the legitimate, natural effect of the system of African slavery. Carry it into the Territories, and the *same results* will follow. Free labor will be degraded; free speech suppressed; and free men, guilty of no offence against the laws, lynched, tarred and feathered, whipped, hung, and *driven out*, by the menaces, howlings, and infuriated ravings of a fanatical, blood-thirsty mob. These are the practical consequences growing out of *Democratic* doctrines, as enunciated and expounded in 1860.

11. I arraign the Democratic party in the South for an attempt, now being made on their part, to deprive the people of the free States of their right of FRANCHISE, secured to them in article two of the Constitution of the United States, and in section twelve of the amendments to the same. These provisions secure to the PEOPLE of all the States the right, once in four years, to elect a President and Vice President by a majority of electoral votes. Strange and monstrous as is

the proposition, yet it is no more strange than true, that a portion of the South have undertaken to dictate to the freemen of the North as to how and for whom they shall vote. It is substantially a proposition of the South to oversee the North in the exercise of the dearest right an American citizen has under the Constitution—the right to act free and untrammeled at the ballot-box. The people of the free States were gravely told by their Southern brethren, prior to the last Presidential election, "We will permit you to elect Buchanan; but if you have the audacity to elect Fremont, we will blow up the Government." And we are now substantially told the same thing; for we have been solemnly warned, in this House and out of it, to beware how we vote; to be "careful and not elect a Republican President in 1860; if you do, we will resist his inauguration."

An honorable member from Georgia, [Mr. CRAWFORD,] in a speech in this House, December 15, said:

"Now, in regard to the election of a Black Republican President, I have this to say—and I speak the sentiment of every Democrat on this floor from the State of Georgia—we will never submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Applause from the Democratic benches, and hisses from the Republicans.] I repeat it, sir—and I have authority to say so—that no Democratic Representative from Georgia on this floor will ever submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Renewed applause and hisses.]"

Another honorable gentleman, from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] in a speech upon this floor, December 21, speaking of the time when the South would be in favor of taking steps for disunion, said:

"You ask me, when will the time come; when will the South be united? It will be when you elect a Black Republican—Hale, Seward, or Chase—President of the United States. Whenever you undertake to place such a man to preside over the destinies of the South, you may expect to see us divided and inviolate friends, and to see all parties of the South arrayed to resist his inauguration."

But I will defer what further remarks I desire to make under this head, and finish them under my next point.

12. Another aggression upon the free States is a threatened attempt to dissolve the Union. As I mean to deal fairly in these matters, I will not charge this attempt upon the South, but upon the so-called Democratic party, where it belongs; for I thank Heaven we have upon this floor, from the sunny South, as noble a band of patriots as ever rallied under the flag of the Constitution. I refer to the Southern Opposition. Sir, the soul-stirring appeals of the eloquent NELSON and his coadjutors upon this floor, in behalf of our beloved Union, have already met with a warm and cordial response from millions in all parts of the country.

I have said the very existence of the Union is threatened, and I have selected several extracts from speeches made in this House at this session, as reported in the Congressional Globe, in proof of this allegation, to let the people and the country know from what section and party they have come.

"It may be asked, when will the time come when we shall separate from the North? I say candidly, if the views expressed by the gentleman from Lowndes, as he says, common to the Republican party, and if they are determined to

enforce those views, I declare myself ready to-day. I would not ask to delay the time a single hour. \* \* \* But not only in my district, but, I believe, every district in my State, is prepared to take ground in favor of a dissolution of the Union, when you tell them that such are your sentiments and purposes."—Hon. O. R. Singleton, Mississippi.

"The South here asks nothing but its rights. As one of its Representatives, I would have no more; but, as God is my Judge, as one of its Representatives, I would shatter this Republic from turret to foundation-stone before I would take one ute less. [Applause in the galleries.]"—Hon. L. M. Keut, South Carolina.

"Now, sir, however distasteful it may be to my friend from New York, [Mr. CLARK,] however much it may revolt the public sentiment or conscience of this country, I am not ashamed or afraid publicly to avow that the election of William H. Seward, or Salmon P. Chase, or any such representative of the Republican party, upon a sectional platform, ought to be resisted to the disruption of every tie that binds this Confederacy together. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]"—Hon. J. L. M. Curry, Alabama.

"I speak for no one but myself and those I have here the honor to represent, and I say, without hesitation, that upon the election of Mr. Seward, or any other man who endorses and proclaims the doctrines held by him and his party—call him by what name you please—I am in favor of an immediate dissolution of the Union. And, sir, I think I speak the sentiments of my own constituents, and the State of South Carolina, when I say so."—Hon. M. L. Bonham, South Carolina.

"Now, I speak for myself, and not for the delegation. We have endeavored for forty years to settle this question between the North and the South, and find it impossible. I therefore am without hope in the Union; so are hundreds of thousands of my countrymen at home. The most confiding of them all are, sir, for 'equality in the Union, or independence out of it'; having lost all hope in the former, I am for 'INDEPENDENCE NOW, AND INDEPENDENCE FOREVER.'"—Hon. M. J. Crawford, Georgia.

"Gentlemen of the Republican party, I warn you. Present your sectional candidate for 1860, elect him as the representative of your system of labor; take possession of the Government as the instrument of your power in this conflict of 'irrepressible conflict,' and we of the South will tear this Constitution to pieces, and look to our guns for justice and right against aggression and wrong. Decide, then, the destinies of this great country. We are prepared for the decision."—Hon. R. Davis, Mississippi.

"I shall announce the solemn fact, disagreeable though it may be to you as well as to me, to my people as well as to yours, that if this course of aggression shall be continued, the people of the South, of the slaveholding States, will be compelled, by every principle of justice, of honor, and of self-preservation, to disrupt every tie that binds us to the Union—peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must."—Hon. L. J. Gartrell, Georgia.

We have here a distinct proposition addressed to the people of the free States, that there is really an intention on the part of at least a portion of the South to dissolve this Union in a certain contingency, and that contingency is the election of a Republican President. The issue is tendered, and in the name of the people of the North we accept it. We will try the issue; we will test the strength of the Union. Here is the alternative presented to the North: either to abandon their clear, unquestionable rights under the Constitution, freely to participate in the election of a President, or to acknowledge themselves contemptible, servile slaves, by marching up to the polls under duress. I speak for myself and for my people when I say, if the Union cannot stand the election and inauguration of a Republican President, standing upon the platform of the fathers of the Republic, "let it slide;" it is not worth preserving a single hour. And we want no delay in this matter; let the crisis come in 1860. The great Republican party of this country demand that the issue be tried; let it come, and come in 1860.

In the face and eyes of these threats, the Na-

tional Republican Committee have met and issued their call to nominate a candidate for President and Vice President at the next election.

The Republican electors of the several States, the members of the People's party of Pennsylvania, and of the Opposition party of New Jersey, and all others who are willing to co-operate with them in support of the candidates who shall there be nominated, and who are opposed to the policy of the present Administration; to Federal corruption and usurpation; to the extension of slavery into the Territories; to the new and dangerous political doctrine that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into all the Territories of the United States; to the reopening of the African slave trade; to any inequality of rights among citizens; and who are in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas into the Union under the Constitution recently adopted by its people; of restoring the Federal administration to a system of rigid economy; and to the principles of Washington and Jefferson; of maintaining inviolate the rights of the States, and defending the soil of every State and Territory from lawless invasion; and of preserving the integrity of this Union, and the supremacy of the Constitution and laws passed in pursuance thereof, against the conspiracy of the leaders of a sectional party to resist the majority principle as established by this Government at the expense of its existence, are invited to send from each State two delegates from every Congressional district, and four delegates at large, to the Convention."

Mr. Chairman, the sun will rise and set, and that Convention will meet, and adopt a platform embodying the doctrines indicated in the above call; and then it will nominate a statesman, a man of comprehensive, national views, one whose opinions will square with the platform; and then, sir, under the broad, national banner of the "stars and stripes," we will go into the contest, and elect the nominee of the Chicago Convention President of the United States. I will not stop to argue the question whether we can inaugurate the President elect or not. As the gallant Miller said, when charging the enemy's battery at Lundy's Lane, "We shall try."

Some weeks since, I received from a friend several copies of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, under date of December last, in which is related the incidents of a pilgrimage to Wheatland, in 1856, by William M. Correy, who, I understand, was, and is, one of the bright and shining lights of the Democratic party in Ohio. Among others Mr. Correy met at Wheatland was A. D. Banks, then editor of the *South-Side Democrat*. Speaking of a conversation there had with Mr. Banks, Mr. Correy says:

"There was another matter discussed on Mr. B.'s motion. He told us the South would have dissolved the Union if Fremont had been elected President of the United States; that Governor Wise and the Virginia leaders were ready to take the field—march on Washington, depose the Federal officers, take the Treasury, archives, buildings, grounds, &c., declare the Confederation *de facto* overthrown, and the District to have reverted to Virginia, the purpose for which she had conveyed it having failed."

If these representations, which Mr. Correy declares were made to him by Mr. Banks, were true, then we have the programme of "Governor Wise and the Virginia leaders" for dissolving the Confederacy in 1857. It was to have been a foray, not of John Brown, but of Governor Wise; not into Virginia, but *out* of it; not on Harper's Ferry, but the city of Washington. The public buildings, the archives, and the public Treasury, were to be seized and plundered. Well, if that is to be the programme in 1861, Governor Wise and his "Virginia leaders," if they do make a

raid upon the Treasury, after it has been plundered for four years by this profligate Administration, will find it empty as a contribution-box. In view of these things, the question returns: would it be prudent for the people of the free States, after electing a Republican for President, to attempt to inaugurate him and take the reins of Government in 1861? or would it be the "better part of valor" to do as history informs us certain Southern soldiers did when Washington was invaded by a few companies of British soldiers in 1814, who came straggling up from the waters of the Chesapeake—throw away our arms without firing a gun, and leave the "buildings and archives and Treasury (vaults) to the mercy of the invaders?" I might answer, in the words of the good old maxim—"sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." But allow me to suggest, and, in so doing, to use the terse language of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. HICKMAN,] that eighteen million men, reared to industry, with all the appliances of art to assist them, aided by at least four million more of Union men at the South, would devise a way to inaugurate a President; and more than that, to administer the Government under his lead.

13. I charge upon the South, through the agency of the Democratic party, that they are the aggressors in bringing about the present intense slavery agitation in the country; and that they are responsible for all the evils it has produced. You complain of this agitation, and yet you put it out of *our* power to stop it. Who does not remember the halcyon days of national peace and quiet that followed the adoption of the compromise measures of 1850? Men in all parts of the country, if they did not approve, so far "conquered their prejudices" as to acquiesce in these measures. From 1850 to 1854, upon this exciting topic, the political heavens were draped in the mellow light of a serene autumnal day. Who first disturbed this peaceful repose? Who sounded the tocsin of war, which came pealing upon the public ear like an "alarm fire-bell in the night?" I will let Ex-President Fillmore answer the question. In his letter to the New York Union meeting, he said:

"In an evil hour, this Pandora's box of slavery was again opened by what I conceive to be an unjustifiable attempt to force slavery into Kansas by a repeal of the Missouri compromise; and the flood of evils now swelling and threatening to overthrow the Constitution, and sweep away the foundations of the Government itself, and deluge this land with fraternal blood, may all be traced to this unfortunate act."

There never was more truth uttered in the same number of lines—never. I have already said the South repealed the Missouri compromise, and in this I am corroborated by Senator IVERSON, of Georgia, who, in a recent speech in the Senate, when speaking of what Northern Democrats had done for the South, said:

"They aided the South in repealing and removing the Missouri restriction, that degrading badge of Southern inferiority and submission."

Every evil that has grown out of slavery agitation is clearly traceable to this aggressive act.

Then followed your border-russian forays into Kansas, to force slavery upon an unwilling peo-

ple by violence, fire and sword, usurpation, murder, and rapine; and, to cap the climax of your wrongs, you summoned to your aid the contemptible dynasty of James Buchanan, and the discipline of your sectional Democracy, to cram down the throats of the people of Kansas the infamous and atrocious Lecompton Constitution. Did you suppose the people of the free States were sufficiently "servile" and craven-hearted to submit to these outrages upon their rights, and not resist at the ballot-box these unpardonable aggressions? If so, you reckoned "without your host." The Democratic party in the North, which has been "aiding" the South in these acts of wanton aggression, has been stricken down by the uplifted hand of an indignant, patriotic people. If the South had not slaughtered the glorious old Whig party in the house of its friends, and completely demoralized and sectionalized that other glorious old party, once led by Jefferson and Jackson, the Republican organization would not have been a matter of necessity. The North, in *self-defense*, inaugurated the great Republican party. The South complain of *Northern sentiment* upon the slavery question. Our answer to our Southern brethren is: *you manufactured it; not we.* You forced upon the country the mistaken measures that have produced it. You have driven every member of the so-called Democratic party from all New England out of both ends of this Capitol.

From the great free Northwest, out of fifty-two members in this House, you have sixteen remaining, and in the other end of the Capitol only five—and growing beautifully less every year. In the middle free States, out of sixty-three members of this House, you have driven out all but seven. In the Thirty-third Congress, which repealed the Missouri compromise, the Democratic party had, from the free States, *ninety-one* members in the House; now that party has but just twenty-six members in this House. And here let it be borne in mind that this decadence has been the direct fruit of Southern aggressions. If any class of men ever had reason to pray fervently and earnestly, "*save us from our friends,*" it is those Democrats in the free States who have undertaken to paddle to the Capitol with Southern millstones about their necks, and have gone down to the bottom under the fury of Southern storms, raking in madness and fury across Northern seas. If Caesar has been stabbed in the American Congress, it is because Caesar has been his own Brutus. But our Southern friends complain because, as they say, there are "one hundred and twelve Black Republicans on this side of the House." Well, gentlemen, *you stirred up* the Northern people to send us here. There always was a *South* in Congress; and now, through your indirect interposition, there is a *North* to take their seats side by side with you in this Hall.

Our people and your people entertain different opinions upon the great question of slavery; and so do you and we, as the representatives of those antagonistic opinions upon this floor. If you say, "*we have Abraham for our father,*" so do we. It was *your fathers*, your immortal Wash-

ington, your Jeffersons, and Madisons, and Henrys, and Masons, and Pinkneys, in conjunction with our fathers, who handed down to us the very doctrines now advocated by the Republican party. Will you denounce us as traitors because we listen to the teachings of your own noble Southern ancestry? Are we to be maligned as enemies to the Constitution because we follow "with a careful tread" in the very footsteps of the heroes and statesmen who framed it? Your fathers believed slavery to be a great social, moral, and political evil; and that it was wrong, and against the best interests of our common country, to spread and perpetuate it; and while you have broken down their old landmarks, we of the North stand by them.

But you complain on account of the raid of John Brown into Virginia. I admit you have reason to complain of the act. I most unqualifiedly condemn the acts of Brown and his mad followers in their attempts to disturb the domestic relations of a sovereign State; but while I do this, I deny that the people of the free States, or the Republican party, ought to be held responsible in any sense for the acts of Brown and his followers. Mr. Fillmore, who, I believe, is good Southern authority, in his New York letter, said:

"The lamentable tragedy at Harper's Ferry is clearly traceable to this unfortunate controversy about slavery in Kansas."

Had there, then, been no raids into Kansas to force slavery into that Territory, there would have been none into Virginia to force slavery out of it. Violence begets violence; and the seed sown in Kansas germinated in Virginia. It is easier to raise a storm of domestic violence than to quell it. But, sir, it is not to be denied that slavery is a dangerous element of itself, in any State or community where it exists. Who can sit down and read the debates in the Virginia Legislature in 1832, without becoming impressed with this idea?

In one of the most eloquent speeches that ever I read, the Hon. James McDowell, jun., afterwards Governor of Virginia and a distinguished member of Congress, said:

"It has been frankly and unquestionably declared, from the very commencement of this debate, by the most decided enemies of abolition themselves, as well as others, that this property is an '*evil*,' and that it is a *DANGEROUS* property. Yes, sir; so dangerous has it been represented to be, even by those who desire to retain it, that we have been reproached for speaking of it, otherwise than in *fresido* whispers; reproached for entertaining debate upon it in this Hall."

Hon. Charles J. Faulkner, just appointed by Mr. Buchanan to the French mission, in a speech in the Virginia House of Delegates, January 20, 1832, in speaking of the slave population in that State, said:

"Sir, to the eye of the statesman as to the eye of Omnipotence, dangers pressing, and dangers that must necessarily press, are alike present. With a single glance he embraces Virginia now with the ELEMENTS OF DESTRUCTION resting quietly upon her bosom, and Virginia lighted from one extremity to the other with the torch of servile insurrection and massacre. It is not sufficient for him that the match is not yet applied. It is enough that the magazine is open, and that the match will shortly be applied."

I speak not of these things to reproach Virginia, but adduce them as facts worthy of serious

consideration ; facts not only admitted but proved by some of Virginia's most distinguished statesmen. I will repeat what has been said so many times before, that the Republican party all over the country is opposed to any and all measures which tend to disturb the domestic relations between master and slave in those States where it lawfully exists; at the same time they are in favor of all constitutional, lawful measures which will prevent its extension now and forever.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words in reply to the threats of disunion which have so often been made on the Democratic side of this House, and I have done. And it is a significant fact, that should go out to the country, that all political organizations in this House, excepting the Democratic party, are willing to unite upon broad national grounds for the preservation of the Union. When gentlemen talk about a dissolution of the Union, there are two views to be taken of the subject. The history of the past discloses the fact that the Union has often been threatened before, and as often dissolved; and yet these marble columns steadily maintain their places, and instead of States going *out* of the Union, they have all the time been coming *in*, until we have a glorious galaxy of thirty-three States. A serious purpose to dissolve the Union involves the grave inquiry, *how can it be done?* If I understand the theory of those who advocate this doctrine, it is this: that a State, in its sovereign capacity, has a right to judge for itself, and determine, independently of the General Government or of the other States, how long it shall remain in the Union; and whenever it determines no longer to remain in the Confederacy, it can peaceably secede. Against this doctrine I enter my solemn protest. For the sake of the argument, if it were true, that the Union was a simple compact between the States, it would require the consent of all the parties to the compact to permit one of its members to go *out*; hence there could be no such thing as a peaceable dissolution of such Union.

But the States, as independent sovereignties, did not make the Constitution; it was the work of the people, as expressed in the preamble: "We, the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution." Every citizen is a citizen not only of his State, but of the United States, and has a right, under the Federal Constitution, to claim its protection. But how can a State settle the point that they will secede? It can only be done by a majority, acting through its Legislature or by Convention; and in such a case, what becomes of the minority, who are opposed to secession? They cannot be forced *out* of the Union by majorities, because they are *citizens of the United States*, and have a right to claim the protection the Constitution affords *all* its citizens. Again, so far as the several States consented, as sovereignties, to enter the Union, there was no reservation of a right to withdraw. The bond was to be perpetual. Hence it is clear that there can be no such thing as a peaceful secession. The Constitution (article one, section eight) gives Congress the power to "provide for the common defence and general welfare of the UNITED

STATES;" "to make *all* laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," (in section eight,) "and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or office thereof."

The President, before entering upon the execution of his office, is obliged by the Constitution to take an oath or affirmation, that he will, "according to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend, the Constitution of the United States." [Article two, section one.] The Constitution [article three, section three] gives Congress the power to "declare the punishment of treason;" and they have done it. Any attempt on the part of a State, or of any of its citizens, to break up the Union, is rebellion against the laws of Congress and war upon the Constitution, and "*levying war against the United States*," which the Constitution, in the same article, declares to be "*treason*." In such an event, it would be the duty of the President of the United States, by virtue of his oath, and the authority with which he is vested by the Constitution, to put down such rebellion, and, if necessary, to use the "army and navy of the United States" to aid in doing it. And it would be equally the duty of the Federal courts to try all persons engaged in such overt acts, and, if found guilty, hang them high as Haman. There is no such thing as secession without revolution—the one necessarily involves the other. The *people* made this Government and "established the Constitution," and they can abolish it by revolution, and in no other way. Any other construction of the Constitution would make it a mere rope of sand—a Government liable to fly into fragments at any moment, with no cohesive power to perpetuate its existence or protect itself against domestic violence, insurrection, and treason.

Sir, this Government cost too much blood and treasure to be destroyed upon any slight pretext under it. From thirteen feeble colonies, with three million inhabitants, we have, in a little more than seventy years, advanced with giant strides until we have thirty-three powerful States, and about twenty-eight million inhabitants.

Our national domain has increased from eight hundred and twenty thousand six hundred and eighty, to two million nine hundred and thirty-six thousand one hundred and sixty-six square miles. It stretches across the continent from ocean to ocean, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the frigid regions of the North. Our natural resources are unbounded. Our waving fields not only yield a generous return to the hand of the husbandman, but furnish bread for the world. Our workshops dot every valley and encircle every hill, while the busy hum of machinery sends forth its music from almost every gurgling stream and waterfall. The pliant hand of American industry has digged down into the mine of the earth, developing our vast mineral resources, furnishing, not only to America, but the world, the precious metals—coal, iron, lead, and other valuable productions, lying in the subterranean regions beneath our feet. All over our land, as by the hand

of magic, have sprung into active life splendid and magnificent cities, mighty in wealth, vast in population, abounding in marts of trade and the bustle of mercantile life.

Along our coasts, washed by the ebbing and flowing tides of two mighty oceans, may be heard the chinking music of the axe, the saw, and the mallet, plied by the ingenious hands of American mechanics, transferring the rugged oak and the lofty pine into "ships which go down into the deep" to whiten every ocean and every sea with their canvas, and visit every port around the vast circle of the globe. Our institutions of learning, our colleges, our academies, and common schools, travel along *pari passu* with the advancing wave of a refined American civilization, all over our States and Territories. Among our sons and daughters, there is none too poor to tread the classic halls of lore, or climb the rugged "hills of science." From every part of our land, the church spire points away to heaven; and in these temples, made with hands, the God of our fathers is adored and worshipped by their posterity. Our country is bound together by bands of iron, spreading themselves like one vast network in every direction, annihilating space, bringing distant cities near; while the thundering tramp of the fiery steed and the shrill scream of the locomotive are echoed and re-echoed wherever the arts of American industry have found a home. Through the instrumentality of American inventive genius, thought, with lightning speed, flashes over a thousand wires, makes far-off distant cities next-door neighbors, while New Orleans, Boston, Charleston, and Chicago, tip their beavers and shake hands before breakfast.

Where is the American citizen that can glance his eyes over this young but mighty Western empire—this beacon-light of warning to tyrants and despots in the Old World—this land, where the hand of honest toil and industry reaps a sure reward, without patriotic emotions and national pride? Who can gaze upon the "stars and stripes"—the proud banner under whose floating folds our brave countrymen from every section have fought the battles of a common country—and then indulge in a desire to strike it down, and trail it in the dust? We gaze upon these lofty domes, colossal pillars, and marble columns; we view these standing evidences of national wealth and greatness—then turn away to inquire, where is the American citizen that is ready to strike them down a heap of ruins? Our country in the past had its lights and shades, its sunshine and its storms. "Clouds and darkness" have sometimes hung low over our political horizon; the lightning's flash, and hoarse, muttering thunder foreboded the coming storm; yet they have passed away behind the beautiful rainbow of peace, cheering the patriot's heart with bright visions of promise and hope. Shall we, instead of learning wisdom from the past, and in God's good time correcting the evils in the Union, rush madly out of it?

We talk of disunion; and yet how can we do it without waking up the memories of the past? Comes there not a voice from the sequestered

shades of Mount Vernon, rolling over the waters of the Potomac in trumpet tones, exclaiming: "Stay the rude hand, already uplifted to disturb the peaceful repose of the mighty dead, and desecrate the quiet home of the sleeping hero?" Will you visit that hallowed spot, just rescued from the destroying hand of time by the benevolence and affection of American mothers and daughters, from the North, the South, the East, and the West, with the frightful torch-light of civil war? Shall American citizens fight over the bones of the immortal Warren, under the very shadow of Bunker Hill monument, or rudely contend for the sacred relics entombed at Monticello? Will they invade the peaceful retreats that surround the tombstone which marks the final resting place of Ashland's illustrious departed statesman, or sound the direful alarm of civil war over the grave of Jackson, or insult the ashes of the old hero of the Hermitage? Have we quite forgotten Bunker Hill and Trenton, Saratoga and Yorktown?

But I will indulge in no dreary foreboding upon this subject. This mighty Republic has not yet fulfilled its manifest destiny. Lives there a man, who owes allegiance to American soil, who would hazard the experiment? Roll out your rattling car of disunion from its black Democratic charnel house; dress up your hideous, ghastly goddess of disunion, with habiliments stained with human gore, drawn from the veins of our own brethren. Mount her upon your clanking chariot wheels; drive her, with all the pageantry of an Eastern monarch, through the length and breadth of the Union; everywhere exhibit her bloody hands; her eyes lit up by the fires of hell; her teeth chattering with horrid grimaces, frightful even to the King of Terrors himself; then call upon the American people to fall down and worship the image you have set up; how many would be found ready to worship at her shrine? Just as soon would they cast bodies before the sacrilegious wheels of a Hindoo Juggernaut, as pay homage to such an idol.

No, sir; the American people love and reverence the Union; and, in a spirit of true patriotism, they will cheerfully endure the ills that are in it until they can be corrected, rather than aid in its destruction.

If ever the time shall come when the black flag of disunion shall be unfurled; when the tocsin of civil war, domestic strife, and servile insurrection, shall be sounded; when American hands, guided by the lawlessness of treason, shall be reached forth to pull down the tall pillars which support the American Union; then, from the North and the South, the East and the West; from every hill and valley; from the snow-capped mountains of the North, the sunny fields of the South, and wide-extended prairies of the West, men of brave hearts and strong hands will be seen flocking around one common standard; with steady step and solid columns advancing, shoulder to shoulder, in defence of the CONSTITUTION and the UNION; fighting for their homes and firesides; rallying to the old battle-cry of our fathers, ONE DESTINY, ONE COUNTRY! INDEPENDENCE NOW, AND INDEPENDENCE FOREVER!!



